

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 1-6 presently stand rejected.

Applicants amend the Abstract to correct a minor informality in accordance with U.S. PTO patent practice.

Claims 1 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shigemura (5,753,140) in view of Pekko (4,292,370).

Claims 2, 3, 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shigemura (5,753,140) in view of Pekko (4,292,370) as applied to claims 1 and 4, and further in view of Tsunekatsu (JP 06-123077).

Analysis

Claims 1 and 4 are the only claims in independent form; therefore, the following discussion is initially directed to these independent claims.

Claim 1 is directed to a polarizer which includes a polyvinyl alcohol polarizing element and two protective films that hold the polarizing element therebetween. The moisture content is no more than 3% by weight.

Shigemura is directed to a polarizing sheet for a liquid crystal display. A polarizing film is interposed between a pair of protective films. Shigemura discloses that the protective film has an equilibrium moisture content of less than 3% (col. 3, lines 34-37). However, Shigemura does not provide a moisture content for the polarizer itself, or that the polarizing element is formed of polyvinyl alcohol.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Appln. No. 09/033,893

Pekko is directed to polarizing laminations. Although this reference discloses the use of a polarizing film of polyvinyl alcohol (col. 2, lines 49-50), there is no teaching or suggestion of the moisture content of a polarizer.

In view of the foregoing, even if one were motivated to modify Shigemura in view of Pekko, one would not have arrived at the claimed invention of providing a polarizer having a moisture content of no more than 3%. Thus, claim 1 is patentable

Claim 4 is directed to a method of producing a polarizer. This method includes the steps of sticking two protective films to opposite surfaces of a polyvinyl alcohol polarizing element. The polyvinyl alcohol polarizing element has a moisture content of no more than 15%.

As discussed above, Shigemura is only concerned with the moisture content of the protective film; there is no discussion related to the moisture content of the polarizing element held therebetween.

Pekko fails to overcome the deficiency of Shigemura. Pekko merely teaches the use of a polyvinyl alcohol polarizing element. There is no discussion of its moisture content. Thus, the combination of cited references fails to arrive at claim 4.

In view of the foregoing, claim 4 is patentable.

The remaining rejections are directed to the dependent claims. Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are patentable for at least the same reasons as claims 1 and 4, by virtue of their dependency therefrom.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Appl. No. 09/033,893

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Ellen R. Smith
Registration No. 43,042

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE



23373

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

Date: March 31, 2003

Attorney Docket No.: Q67967